



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

implication, and so may be and is adjudged unreasonable, and is therefore void.

*Special Contract—Damage to Live Stock.*—In *Selby v. Wilmington and W. Ry. Co.*, 18 S. E. Rep. 88, a shipper of live stock made a special contract with the company that, in consideration of reduced rate, he would “as a condition precedent to his right to recover any damage for loss or injury to said stock” notify the company of the loss before the cattle were removed from their place of destination. Held to be a reasonable and valid stipulation.

*Traveling Salesmen—Commissions—Exemptions.*—*Hamburger v. Corr*, 27 Atl. Rep. 681 (Penn.). The plaintiff garnisheed money in the defendant's possession due, as commissions, to the defendant's salesman. Held, that a traveling salesman's commissions, unlike those of factors and brokers, were in the nature of wages and, as such, exempt from attachment under a statute exempting the wages of any laborer and the salary of any person in public or private employment.

*Witness—Competency—Sanity.*—*Dickson et al. v. Waldron*, 35 N. E. Rep. 1 (Ind.). An inoffensive patron of a theatre was assaulted by a special policeman, acting as door-keeper of the theatre. On trial it was decided that the theatre manager was liable for damages. A petition for a rehearing was filed, alleging that the court had erred in allowing the plaintiff to testify, because in his complaint he had alleged that the injuries received had impaired his mind. On rehearing, overruled. Howard, J., says, “Whether at the time of the trial, the appellee was in fact competent to testify, was a question that must be decided by the court then and there. The witness was before the court and jury and whether he had been injured in body or in mind on the occasion of the assault, it does not follow that at the time of the trial he was incompetent to testify.”